DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 110 EC 307 315

AUTHOR Belcastro, Frank P.
TITLE A Survey of Types of Gifted Programs Offered in Iowa Public School Districts.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acceleration (Education); Advanced Placement; Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrichment Activities; *Gifted; Inservice Teacher Education; Postsecondary Education; Professional Development; Program Development; Resource Room Programs; School Districts; *Special Programs; Surveys; *Talent Development
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the outcomes of a 1997 survey of 171 Iowa public school districts on programs offered to gifted students. The survey evaluated whether the school districts offered the following programs: enrichment in the regular classrooms, part-time special classes, full-time special classes, independent study, itinerant teacher, mentorships, resource rooms, special schools, early entrance, continuous progress, nongraded schools, moderate acceleration, radical acceleration, advanced placement, fast-paced courses, or concurrent or dual enrollment. Results found that Iowa school districts are using the following flexible programming techniques: early entrance (20.5 percent), advanced placement (40.9 percent), concurrent enrollment (55 percent), fast-paced courses (12.9 percent), continuous progress (27.5 percent), moderate acceleration (46.2 percent), and radical acceleration (17.5 percent). Except for enrichment in the regular classroom, part-time special classes, concurrent or dual enrollment, and independent study, findings indicated that not even half of the Iowa school districts are providing adequate programs for their gifted students. This 1997 study is compared to a 1990 study by the same person. Several recommendations are made for enhancing gifted programming and include: (1) providing flexible programs; (2) consolidating school districts to enable schools to provide gifted educational programs; (3) setting special requirements for teachers in gifted programs; and (4) providing and funding inservice programs for teachers in gifted programs. (Contains 23 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 110

A SURVEY OF TYPES OF GIFTED PROGRAMS OFFERED IN IOWA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Frank P. Belcastro

University of Dubuque

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Belcastro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

GIFTED SURVEY

EC 307315

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

A national survey of public and parochial school districts was conducted by the Sid W.Richardson Foundation to discover which programs for gifted students were being offered in the nation's schools. Using the national questionnaire, a similar survey of Iowa school districts was conducted in 1997 to determine the kinds of programs offered to gifted in Iowa public school districts. The results indicated that the gifted programs in Iowa fell short of the principle of excellence and need improvement. Recommendations were made and conclusions drawn.

A SURVEY OF TYPES OF GIFTED PROGRAMS OFFERED IN IOWA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The purpose of the Richardson Study was to guide the Sid W. Richardson Foundation of Fort Worth, Texas in decisions about funding educational programs for gifted students. The study was to be national in scope because it was believed that the best practices for educating gifted students would be discovered only in a national survey. The purpose of the study was to answer the central question: What programs for gifted students exist and where are they located? It is the most inclusive report to date on practices for educating gifted students (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985; Cox & Daniel, 1988).

The study gathered information on 16 program types which constitute practices or approaches which are appropriate for gifted students. The program types are:

1. Enrichment in the Regular Classroom
2. Part-Time Special Class
3. Full-Time Special Class
4. Independent Study
5. Itinerant Teacher
6. Mentorships
7. Resource Rooms
9. Early Entrance
10. Continuous Progress
11. Nongraded School
12. Moderate Acceleration
13. Radical Acceleration
14. Advanced Placement
15. Fast-Paced Courses
16. Concurrent or Dual

8. Special School Enrollment

See the questionnaire in Appendix A for a description of these programs.

During the late fall and early spring of the 1996-1997 school year, the national questionnaire was sent to the 379 public school districts in Iowa. One hundred seventy one or 45% of the school districts responded. The purpose of this study was to determine the kinds of programs offered to gifted students in Iowa public school districts. Appendix A contains the questionnaire with the Iowa results filled in.

Sample Characteristics

Following are some of the general characteristics of the responding Iowa school districts.

1. Fifty percent of the respondents were from communities with a population of less than 685; 75% were from communities with a population of less than 1300; only 15.6% were from communities of more than 2000.
2. One hundred percent of the respondents were from public, coeducational schools.
3. An average of 73.5% of Iowa teachers in these respondent school districts had bachelors degrees while 25.8% had masters degrees.
4. The ethnic ratio of the students was as follows: an average of 95% were Anglo, 0.24% were Native Americans,

0.78% were Asian, 1.0% were Hispanic, and 0.89% were Blacks.

Recommendations

The criteria used for the evaluation of the specific components of each of the 16 gifted programs as listed in the questionnaire, for the evaluation of the aspects of gifted programs overall as listed in the questionnaire, and for the recommendations that follow are: (a) 90% of Iowa school districts possess the positive component noted or (b) 10% of Iowa school districts do not possess the negative component noted.

1. At the conclusion of the Richardson Study, recommendations were made which can be summarized in this one phrase: comprehensive programming, which meets a wide range of abilities and brings together all of the resources of the educational community (Cox & Gluck, 1989; Kelly, 1989). The heart of comprehensive programming is flexible pacing which includes seven of the 16 programs types for gifted students found in the Richardson Study. These seven program types and the percent of Iowa school districts using them are as follows: Early Entrance (20.5%), Advanced Placement (40.9%), Concurrent Enrollment (55.0%), Fast-Paced Course (12.9%), Continuous Progress (27.5%), Moderate Acceleration (46.2%), and Radical Acceleration (17.5%).

It is recommended that Iowa school districts end their failure in their flexibility to intellectually gifted students by providing these programs recommended by this national study and which are needed by these gifted students.

2. Except for Enrichment in the Regular Classroom (86.0%), Part-Time Special Class (91.8%), Concurrent or Dual Enrollment (55.0%), and Independent Study (63.7%) programs, Iowa school districts' provisions for programs for gifted students range from 2.3% (Special School) to 49.7% (Itinerant Teacher). Except for the above four programs for gifted students, not even half of the Iowa school districts are providing adequate programs for their gifted students. It is recommended that all Iowa schools provide these programs for gifted students.

3. Part of the problem that Iowa schools have in providing programs for gifted students is that they are too small. Seventy-five percent of the school districts are in communities with populations of less than 1300; that means that the population of the schools themselves are considerably smaller. Without a minimum base of population (and, thus, a minimum financial base) in a school district, a minimum educational program cannot be provided for the regular students, much less the gifted ones. It is recommended

that the Iowa legislature mandate consolidation among school districts setting the minimum school population necessary for an adequate educational program.

4. With a minority base of 5% and an Anglo population of 95%, multicultural experiences are almost impossible in Iowa schools. It is recommended that Iowa schools make every effort to foster communication with minority students not only within the state but outside the state through the avenues of mail, telephone, interactive television, e-mail, the internet and visits.

5. Almost 61% of Iowa schools having special requirements for teachers in the gifted programs; that means that 39% of schools do not have any special requirements for teachers in order to teach gifted students. One of the seven basic principles offered by Belcastro (1987) that all programs for the gifted should have is that of "excellent teachers who have been thoroughly trained in gifted education and who are temperamentally suited to interact with intellectually gifted students." Maker (1975) offers minimum criteria for the selection of teachers of the gifted and research has shown repeatedly that the single most important variable in determining the success of an approach is the teacher (Callahan & Renzulli, 1977; Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, Gage & Berliner, 1979). It is

recommended that those deficient school districts set special requirements for teachers in gifted programs or that the legislature mandate them.

6. Inservice training on a regular basis is an important feature of any gifted program in order to keep those involved and informed of the latest in gifted education. Yet, 45.0% of teachers in gifted programs, 48.5% of counselors, and 45.6% of administrators in Iowa do not receive such training. It is recommended that Iowa schools provide and fund inservice programs on a regular basis for these school personnel.

7. Almost one-third (29.6%) of the schools do not have a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level responsible for the gifted program. Without administrative responsibility and oversight, gifted programs do not receive the needed attention at the level where funding and resource decisions are made. Ownership of the gifted programs is absent and neglect is the inevitable consequence. It is recommended that all Iowa schools provide a staff member at the supervisory or administrative level who will be responsible for the gifted programs in their schools.

8. While almost all Iowa schools use the library as a resource in their gifted programs, 46.0% do not use the museum, 49.7% do not use industry, 60.1% do not use

government agencies, and 37.4% do not use mentors as resources in their gifted programs. Although many Iowa schools are located in rural areas or small towns and thus farther from museums, industry, and government agencies, concerted efforts should be made for gifted programs to make use of these resources for their students. Field trips in combination with other schools in the area would help defray expenses and have social advantages as well.

9. Over one-third (34.7%) of Iowa schools have goals for their gifted programs written at the building level instead of the district level. It is recommended that these deficient schools cease the practice of writing goals for the gifted programs at the building level and encourage school districts to set district-wide goals so that uniformity and fairness would result.

10. There are gifted programs in Iowa schools where 53.6% do not include parents, 36.9% do not include teachers, 41.1% do not include administrators, and 74.4% do not include students in an advisory group for those programs. It is recommended that all Iowa schools include parents, teachers, administrators, and students in their advisory groups for their gifted programs.

11. Special procedures for evaluating gifted programs are established in 40.5% of Iowa schools at the

building level instead of at the district level. It is recommended that these schools change so that these special procedures will be at the district level in order to have broader input into the establishment of these procedures and to enhance their importance.

12. Using the results for the Enrichment in the Regular Classroom gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. the whole class not be involved in enrichment activities along with intellectually gifted students since 60.5% of the school district involved the whole class. If enrichment activities are to challenge gifted students through the higher order skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, then the whole class cannot be involved since regular students cannot operate at those three levels readily. If the whole class in involved, either the material will be too hard for the regular students or too easy for the intellectually gifted students. Since regular classroom teachers make very few changes in their instruction for gifted students (Tomilson, 1995; Westberg, Archambault, Dobyns, & Salvin, 1993), intellectually gifted students will be at a disadvantage in this type of gifted program. Because of these disadvantages, this type of gifted program should be eliminate and replaced with the full-time

special class program.

b. more time be allotted per week to enrichment activities for gifted students (68.1% of the school districts allot less than three hours per week to enrichment activities). Because gifted students learn in a fraction of the time that regular students do, there is time in the class day to engage in enrichment activities; but regular students have little if any time left for enrichment activities. This conflict results in the above finding which deprives gifted students of enrichment time because they are included in the classroom with regular students. When gifted students are placed in classes with only gifted students for their areas of giftedness and with the regular students for all other activities, this deprivation will end.

c. more content areas be enriched (only about half of the school districts enrich the content areas of mathematics, science, English and social studies);

d. more individualized instruction be used as an enrichment strategy since that is the logical strategy to accommodate gifted students (39.2% of the school districts do not use this strategy).

13. Using the results for the Part-time Special Class (pull-out) gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. the class meet more days per week (34.5% meet one

day a week and only 7.9% meet five days a week) and that the length of the class session be more than an hour (69.9% meet for less than one hour). It is not inherent that gifted students are gifted at certain times and not at other times; it is not inherent that they are gifted only one or two days a week or certain times during the day. The are always gifted. What is necessary is to be challenged and to be given the time in which to use their gifts. Gifted students should be with other gifted students in classes that meet five days a week. Gifted students are affected when they spend extended periods of time with regular students where the ceiling of expectations are those of the regular students and thus too low for the gifted students. In these situations, the gifted students' capacity is bent, misshapen and malformed, exactly as their bodies would be if placed in physical places where the ceilings are too short for their heights.

b. content areas be studied in these classes; 48.3% of the schools do not use mathematics as a content area, 64.7% do not use science, 57.1% do not use English or language arts, and 67.9% do not use social studies as content areas. Too often, part-time special classes are seen as non-academic classes where students engage in challenging activities in areas other than the traditional school program. For the intellectually

gifted, studying in content areas means studying in areas which are three or four or more grades below the grade levels of their knowledge. In these classes, students should be advancing beyond the grade levels of their knowledge in the traditional areas listed above. The solution of puzzles and games (71.2%) in the name of critical thinking should not replace critical thinking in the content areas, which is the prime purpose of the schools.

c. regular classroom teachers and the special class teachers co-ordinate their curricular plans regularly since 85.7% do not;

d. students who attend these classes not be penalized by being required to make up work covered in the regular classroom, since 66.7% of them are so required. This denigrates the gifted program in the eyes of the school community and the community at large.

e. this program be replace with the full-time special class because of the part-time special class's many disadvantages: it is not a total program because it is isolated, fragmented, time-limited, lacks continuity, and lacks integration and coordination with other school programs (Cox & Daniel, 1984). One of the conclusions of the Richardson Study is that pull-out programs are a part-time solution to a full-time problem (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985).

14. Using the results for the Full-time Special Class gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. content areas be studied in these classes: 37.5% do not study mathematics, 66.1% do not study science, 53.6% do not study English or language arts, and 73.2% do not study social studies. One wonders what students do in these full-time special classes since the traditional academic subjects are barely covered. Challenging activities such as puzzles and mystery solving have their place but are no substitute for the primary purpose of the school--academic learning.

b. more school districts use this program type since 65.5% of them do not. It meets the seven principles or criteria for a minimally adequate program for intellectually gifted students, i.e., the program is tied to the regular curriculum, it provides placement and interaction with intellectual peers, it is in effect all day and every day, it challenges students at their own intellectual level developing general processes and skills at a pace that matches the gifted students' learning rate, and it assures the selection not only of a highly homogeneous group of intellectually-able students but also of teachers trained in gifted education who have particular, specified traits (Belcastro, 1987). This program is the best option to promote the academic, social, and

emotional growth of intellectually gifted students (Willis, 1995).

15. Using the results for the Independent Study gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. more time per week be allotted to it; while independent study hours needed vary by student maturity and student project, the allotted hours should be generous with restrictions set individually by the parent or teacher of the gifted child.

b. more content areas be used by students: 66.4% of them do not study mathematics, 63.6% do not study science, 62.6% do not study English or language arts, and 66.4% do not study social studies. For the gifted, the traditional subjects will be the ones studied in college and universities and more schools should encourage them as independent study areas than do the approximately one-third of the schools.

c. more school districts use this type of program since 36.3% of the school districts do not.

16. Using the results for the Itinerant Teacher gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. itinerant teachers teach in a permanent classroom assigned for that purpose, since 68.7% do not. Having a permanently assigned classroom is an indication of the worth of a program by the administration. In Iowa, it appears that itinerant teachers of the gifted are

not considered as worthy as some other programs; this attitude is not lost on the gifted students and their families and on the other school personnel as well. This impinges negatively on the learning as well as the treatment of these gifted students.

b. the regular classroom teacher and the itinerant teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans regularly, since 83.0% do not.

17. Using the results for the Mentorship gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. more school time be allotted to a student to work with a mentor than the more than 81.0% that allow less than three hours per week; while mentorship hours vary by student maturity and the project involved, the allotted hours should be generous with individual hours set by the teacher or mentor in consultation with the teacher.

b. less school staff be used as mentors (60.8%); using school staff is an expedient way to provide minimal service. As expert as school staff members might be, when they are used, opportunities are lost to have experts in a wide variety of fields interact with gifted students both academically and socially.

c. mentors receive special training since 79.2% of them do not. There are specialized knowledge and precautions that mentors should know before working

with young people and training is an efficient way of imparting this information.

d. more school districts use this type of program for the gifted since only 36.3% of them use it.

18. Using the results for the Resource Rooms gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. teachers of intellectually gifted students encourage students to make more use of the resource room (83.6% of the students spend less than three hours a week in the resource room) and make more assignments that require the use of resources so that the scope of the work of the intellectually gifted students is not restricted. Both enrichment programs and individualized learning require the use of resources. Generally, the less time spent in the resource room, the more restricted the scope of the work of the gifted students.

b. more films be made available in the resource rooms since 49.3% of them do not; films uniquely provide information and concepts that are difficult to obtain: slow, fast and regular motion, sequence of events, close-ups of events, poignant moments, and magnification of microscopic material. To deny students these aspects is to limit their education.

c. resource rooms be located in separate rooms since 27.9% of them are not;

d. more schools use this program type since 55.6% do not.

19. Using the results for the Special Schools gifted program, it is recommended that more of them be established since only 2.3% of the school districts have them. That most school districts are too small to have one is yet another reason for mandated school consolidation. Cooperation among school districts for a regional special school is also recommended.

20. Using the results for the Early Entrance gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. more provision for it be made at every level since 72.4% of the school districts do not have provisions at the kindergarten level, 55.2% do not have provisions at the first grade level, 51.7% do not have provisions at the middle/junior high school level, and 27.6% do have provisions at the senior high school level;

b. more school districts use this type of gifted program since only 20.5% of the school districts do so. There are many students who are two, three, and even four grades above the achievement level of their assigned grade level; for these students, early entrance at all levels that are deemed necessary would recognize their achievements, discourage negative habits of doing little or no work because the material has already been achieved, and discourage the false

expectations that everything in life comes easy and that no effort is necessary, all because they have not been challenged.

21. Using the results for the continuous progress gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. it be used by more schools at each level since 31.1% of the schools do not use it at the elementary level, 42.2% do not use it at the middle/junior high school level, and 44.4% do not use it at the senior high school level; when less Iowa schools use continuous progress at these three levels, it can be expected that less intellectually gifted students will be functioning above grade level, since intellectually gifted students learn at a faster rate than average students.

b. it be used more often in the content areas in order to allow students to advance at their own pace since 67.4% do not use it in science, 91.3% do not use it in social studies, 56.5% do not use it in reading and language arts, 78.3% do not use it in English, and 91.3% do not use it foreign languages. Reading and language arts are content areas that are vitally important for communication and interaction; thus, more Iowa schools should use these areas as well as other content areas for continuous progress for gifted students.

c. it be used more often as a program since only 27.5% of the school districts use it. A major advantage of the continuous progress program is that intellectually gifted students are not held back at the pace of the regular students and thus do not waste learning time over the school year. A motivational factor in the continuous progress programs is that intellectually gifted students are with their intellectual peers. Perhaps the key characteristic of intellectually gifted students is that their rate of learning new information is much faster than average. Evidence for this comes from both evaluation of intellectually gifted students' learning in classroom situations as well as from experimental psychology (George & Denham, 1976; Keating & Bobbitt, 1978). Continuous progress programs take into account this key characteristic. It follows that schools should move from continuous progress to full-time special classes as a policy as early as possible.

22. Using the results for the Nongraded School gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. it be used by more schools at each level since 20% do not use it at the elementary level, 70% do not use it at the middle/junior high school level, and 70% do not use it at the senior high school level;

b. more school districts use it since only 7.0% of

them use it. The nongraded school offers something for all students: the intellectually gifted students advance at their own learning rate which is a faster one than normal, the slower students also advance at their own learning rate which is slower than normal. Mastery is assured since there is no pressure to move at the pace of other students and as much time as necessary is spent in each content area.

23. Using the results for the Moderate Acceleration gifted program, it is recommended that more schools use it since only 46.2% of them do so. One study has shown that accelerated students had better perceptions of their social relationships and emotional development and tended to have fewer serious school behavior problems than did regular students (Sayler & Brookshire, 1993).

24. Using the results for the Radical Acceleration gifted program, it is recommended that it be used by more schools since only 17.5% of them do so. There are many intellectually gifted students who could complete high school in eleven or less years if given the opportunity through the radical acceleration gifted program. By doing so, they would be with their intellectual peers in college and would be in the market place earlier, thus gaining financially and starting earlier in a career. In a study of

extraordinarily gifted children, Gross (1993) noted that those who were radically accelerated reported higher self esteem and that depression and social problems plagued those who had not.

25. Using the results for the College Board Advanced Placement gifted program, it is recommended that:

a. more schools offer advanced placement in more content areas since 64.1% of them do not offer it in American History; 64.1% do not offer it in Biology, 70.3% do not offer it in Chemistry, 37.5% do not offer it in English literature, 85.9% do not offer it in European History, 93.7% do not offer it in French, 98.4% do not offer it in German, 29.7% do not offer it in mathematics, 84.4% do not offer it in physics, and 90.6% do not offer it in Spanish. Part of the problem surely is the size of the school districts which prohibits offering the second or third year of any subject, much less an advanced placement class, thus depriving their students of educational opportunities, especially intellectually gifted students.

b. more schools offer it since only 40.9% of the school districts do so. Consolidation of school districts with a minimum student body size would permit the offering of advanced placement classes. In the meantime, combining students from several neighboring

school districts to form an advanced placement class might be a solution.

26. Using the results for the Fast-paced courses gifted program, it is recommended that more school districts use it since only 12.9% of them do so.

27. Using the results for the Concurrent or Dual Enrollment gifted program, it is recommended that more school districts use it since only 55.0% of them do so. It is advantageous, logical, and efficient for intellectually gifted students to be able to take courses at the next higher level when they already know the material for their present level; it is also educational sound and imperative that students not repeat material they already know because of the artificial barrier of the assignment of school classes to separate buildings.

For the most advanced students, mentorships and accelerated opportunities such as taking college classes while in the middle school or high school would help meet their needs. Research has shown that these students are able to do college-level work in mathematics and physics while still in middle school and high school (Ravaglia, Suppes, Stillinger, & Alper, 1995).

Previous Study Comparison

This present study is a replication of the spring

1990 study (Belcastro, 1992) which shares its same purpose of determining what programs for gifted students existed in Iowa public schools using the national questionnaire. In 1987 the Iowa legislature passed a law, which took effect in July, 1989, mandating that gifted programs be offered in Iowa schools. The 1990 study represented the initial offerings of gifted programs in Iowa schools while the 1997 study represents the full offerings.

Has the law made a difference in the quantity and quality of offerings of gifted programs in Iowa schools? Since not all Iowa schools offered gifted programs in 1990, it is obvious that the quantity of program offering increased. There was a statistically significant increase in all gifted program offerings except Resource Rooms and Early Entrance programs, which also increased but the increase was not statistically significant.

Qualitatively, there were positive and negative differences. For positive differences, in 1997 there were statistically significant increases in the number of teachers and counselors who participated in inservice training on a regular basis than did in 1990 (83.4% and 51.5% vs. 74.6% and 39.6%); in the Part-time Special Class (pull-out) gifted program, there was a statistically significant increase in the

percent of school districts which permitted the following to be studied: mathematics (27.6% vs. 41.7%), science (25.4% vs. 35.3%), social studies (21.9% vs. 32.1%), and English/language arts (29.4% vs. 42.9%); there was a statistically significant decrease (29.1% vs. 13.5%) in the percent of school districts whose curricular materials for the Full-time Regular Class gifted program were the same as those studied in the regular classes; a statistically significant decrease (66.7% vs. 56.7%) in the percent of school districts devoting less than three hours per week to independent study in its program; a statistically significant decrease (82.0% vs. 60.8%) in the percent of school districts which use school staff as mentors in the Mentorship gifted program; and a statistically significant increase (76.2% vs. 91.3%) in the percent of school districts which used the Continuous Progress gifted program which allows students in the content area of mathematics to advance at their own pace.

There were also qualitatively negative differences between the 1990 and 1997 surveys. There were statistically significant decreases in the percent of school districts which included teachers (76.7% vs. 63.1%) and administrators (70.0% vs. 58.9%) in an advisory group for the gifted and talented programs and a statistically significant increase (19.6% vs. 34.5%)

in the percent of school districts where such an advisory group does not exist at all; a statistically significant decrease (69.1% vs. 58.9%) in the percent of school districts whose special procedures for evaluating the gifted/talented programs were established at the district level rather than a the building level and a statistically significant increase (8.8% vs. 16.1%) in the percent of school districts which have neither special procedure; in the Enrichment in the Regular Classroom gifted program, a statistically significant increase (39.9% vs. 60.5%) in the percent of school districts which involve all of the class in enrichment activities intended for gifted students and a statistically significant decrease (46.0% vs. 31.9%) in the percent of school districts which involve gifted students plus others but not the entire class in enrichment activities intended for gifted students; and in the Part-time Special Class (pull-out) gifted program, a statistically significant increase (61.6% vs. 71.2%) in the percent of school districts which used puzzles and games as a strategy instead of the strategies of special projects and individualized instruction.

Note that only one of the positive qualitative changes and none of the negative qualitative changes meet the criteria of 90% of the school districts

possessing positive program components or 10% not possessing negative program components. Of the 200 program components, only 18 changes (9%) from 1990 to 1997 were statistically significant. Further, 86.0% of the school districts offer the Enrichment in the Regular Classroom gifted program and 91.8% of them offer the Part-time Special Class gifted program despite the serious deficiencies in both programs. Obviously, the school districts took the line of least resistance by taking refuge in these two programs which are the least likely to benefit gifted students.

However, the largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) and the smallest-enrollment school districts (0 - 199) differed in almost all of the programs components, in favor of the largest-component school districts (Belcastro & Kelly, 1996). In another study (Iowa Department of Education, 1995), the average curriculum units offered and taught by public school districts in Iowa in the 1994-1995 school year varied by enrollment categories; in the subject areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Foreign Languages, as the enrollment category increased, the number of average curriculum units offered increased. The discrepancy between the lowest enrollment category (<250) and the highest enrollment category (7500+) in average curriculum units

taught in these subject areas varied from 4.5 times to 9.3 times as many in favor of the highest enrollment category. These differences in standards, resources, and procedures give an advantage to the larger school districts because there are greater resources of material and personnel and greater flexibility and quality in these districts. This size differential is yet another reason for the Iowa legislature to mandate school consolidation so that minimally adequate educational programs can be offered and so that both gifted and regular students can be offered the opportunity to take as many curriculum units as desired.

Apparently, requiring school districts to offer gifted programs is not enough. While school consolidation may not be politically feasible, the Iowa legislature can at least direct the Iowa Department of Education to oversee the elimination of both the Enrichment in the Regular Classroom and the Part-time Special Class gifted programs over a specified period of time. In addition, it can direct the Department of Education to use the 200 program components in the questionnaire as well as the suggestions in this survey as guides in monitoring the quality of the gifted programs offered by Iowa school districts and then funding whatever changes are made.

Summary Conclusions

For those Iowa school districts deficient in any of the 200 program components of the gifted programs, it is concluded that those schools should:

a. follow the recommendations of the national Richardson Study by making use of comprehensive programming which involves flexible pacing by offering the seven program types of Early Entrance, Advanced Placement, Concurrent Enrollment, Fast-paced Courses, Continuous Progress, Moderate Acceleration, and Radical Acceleration;

b. institute special requirements for teachers of gifted programs;

c. include all teachers of gifted programs as well as counselors and administrators as participants in inservice training on a regular basis;

d. assign staff members at the supervisory or administrative level to be responsible for the gifted programs;

e. use museums, industry, and government agencies as resources for gifted programs;

f. include teachers, parents, and students in advisory groups for gifted programs;

g. write goals for the gifted programs at the district levels instead of at the building level or not at all;

h. establish special procedures for evaluating gifted

programs at the district level instead of at the building level or not at all;

i. increase local special funding for gifted students while encouraging the Iowa legislature to give the gifted the same fiscal consideration that it gives to handicapped students;

j. phase out the Enrichment in the Regular Classroom and Part-time Special Class (pull-out) programs; substitute full-time special classes, instead;

k. where enrichment classes must be used: (1) not involved all of the class in enrichment activities intended for intellectually gifted students but separate these activities, (2) allow five or more hours per week for enrichment activities, (3) enrich content areas instead of non-academic activities, and (4) use individualized instruction and special projects as enrichment strategies;

l. where pull-out programs must be used: (1) meet five days per week, (2) provide two or more hours for the classes to meet, (3) study content areas (mathematics, science, English/language arts, social studies), (4) require regular classroom teachers to coordinate their curricular plans with the special class teacher, and (5) not require students to make up work covered in the regular classroom because they went to the pull-out program;

m. contact federal legislators asking them to increase the very low special funding available for gifted students at the federal level;

n. for the Full-time Special Classes gifted program: (1) require content areas to be studied, (2) not provide the same curricular materials for intellectually gifted students as those provided for regular classes; instead, provide differentiated materials and strategies that challenge the gifted at their own levels of achievements and on higher thinking levels, (3) not use self-selection as the only criterion in assigning students to these classes; instead, have specific selection criteria to accomplish this;

o. for the Independent Study gifted programs: (1) allot five or more hours per week to independent study for intellectually gifted students, and (2) permit and encourage the study of mathematics, science, English/language arts, and social studies as content areas for students in this program;

p. eliminate the use of itinerant teachers by forming regional full-time special classes;

q. where itinerant teachers must be used: (1) require regular classroom teachers to coordinate their curricular plans with the itinerant teachers of the gifted, and (2) provide a permanent classroom for them;

r. for the Mentorship programs: (1) allot five or more hours per week for gifted students to work with mentors, and (2) use less staff and more outside experts as mentors;

s. for the Resource Room gifted programs: (1) allow five or more hours per week for use in a resource room for gifted students, (2) have films and laboratory equipment available, and (3) locate it in a room separate from other student uses and activities;

t. make provisions for early entrance at every level (kindergarten, first grade, middle/junior high school, senior high school) for intellectually gifted students;

u. operate Continuous Progress gifted programs (1) at all levels (pre-school, kindergarten, elementary, middle/junior high school, high school) and (2) allow continuous progress in all content areas;

v. become non-graded schools at as many levels as possible;

w. use both moderate and radical acceleration for intellectually gifted students;

x. offer College Board Advanced Placement gifted programs in all content areas and, for smaller school districts, combine the intellectually gifted students from several neighboring school districts to form an advanced placement class;

y. offer Fast-paced courses and Concurrent or Dual

Enrollment gifted programs;

z. make every effort to foster communication with minority students not only within the state but also outside the state through the avenues of mail, visits, and interactive electronic communications.

Iowa legislature conclusions.

Because the prime responsibility of state legislatures is to act in the public interest and to resolve matters of public concern (Ruppert, 1996), it is concluded that the Iowa legislature act in the public interest by:

a. mandating and funding consolidation of school districts so that the school districts would be large enough to provide, at the least, minimally adequate educational programs and, at the most, superior educational programs;

b. directing the Department of Education to use the 200 program components in the questionnaire as well as the recommendations in this survey as guides in monitoring the quality of the gifted programs offered by Iowa school districts; then fund whatever changes are made;

c. giving gifted students the same fiscal consideration that it gives to handicapped students.

References

Belcastro, F. (1987). Elementary pull-out programs for the intellectually gifted--boon or bane? Roeper Review, 9, 208-212.

Belcastro, F., & Kelly, K. (1996). Richardson Study: Largest vs. smallest school districts in Iowa. Dubuque, IA: University of Dubuque. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 393 235).

Belcastro, F. (1992). Richardson study: Iowa results. Unpublished manuscript. University of Dubuque, Department of Education and Psychology, Dubuque, IA.

Callahan, C. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (1977). The effectiveness of a creativity training program in the language arts. Gifted Child Quarterly, 4, 538-545.

Cox, J., & Daniel, N. (1984). The pull-out model. G/C/T, 34, 55-61.

Cox, J., & Daniel, N. (1988). The Richardson study concludes. G/C/T, 11, 45-47.

Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. O. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and promising practices. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Cox, J., & Gluck, D. (1989). The Richardson study and the pyramid project. G/C/T, 12, 44-46.

Dunkin, M. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1974). The study of teaching. New York: Holt Rinehart Winston.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1979). Educational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

George, W. C., & Denham, S. A. (1976). Curriculum experimentation for the mathematically talented. In D. P. Keating (Ed.), Intellectual talent: Research and development (pp. 103-131). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Gross, M. (1993). Exceptionally gifted children. London: Routledge.

Iowa Department of Education. (1995). The annual condition of education report: A report on elementary, secondary, and community college education in Iowa (6th ed.). Des Moines, IA: Author.

Iowa legislature. (1987). Provision for gifted and talented. (Iowa Standard: Education Department(281) 4.5[12]). Des Moines, IA: Author.

Keating, D. P., & Bobbitt, B. L. (1978). Individual and developmental differences in cognitive processing components of mental ability. Child Development, 49, 155-167.

Kelly, J. (1989). Recommendation: Comprehensive programming. G/C/T, 12, 54-56.

Maker, C. J. (1975). Training teachers for the gifted and talented: A comparison of models. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Ravaglia, R., Suppes, P., Stillinger, C., & Alper, T. (1995). Computer-based mathematics and physics for gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39(1), 7-13.

Ruppert, S. (1996). The politics of remedy: State legislative views on higher education. Littleton, CO: Educational Systems Research.

Sayler, M., & Brookshire, W. (1993). Social, emotional, and behavioral adjustment of accelerated students, students in gifted classes, and regular students in eighth grade. Gifted Child Quarterly, 37(4), 150-154.

Tomilson, C. A. (1995). Deciding to differentiate instruction in middle school: One school's journey. Gifted Child Quarterly, 39(2), 77-87.

Westberg, K., Archambault, F., Dobyns, S., & Salvin, T. (1993). The classroom practices observational study. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16, 120-146.

Willis, S. (1995). Mainstreaming the gifted. Education Update, 37(2), 10-11.

Appendix A

THE RICHARDSON STUDY

IOWA QUESTIONNAIRE
1997 RESULTS

The Sid Richardson Foundation in Fort Worth, Texas, is continuing its national study of elementary and secondary programs for gifted students. We are collecting data on programs that are identified as special programs for the gifted and also on other provisions for the most able and talented students which may not be identified as "Gifted Programs."

This questionnaire, though rather lengthy, should require only a few minutes of your time since not all of it will be applicable to any one district. You will notice that the programs are identified by a Roman numeral in the margin and that they are separated by double lines. We request that you complete the General Information section at the beginning and any other sections which apply to your district. The results of the study will be available state-wide to all who are concerned with this important issue.

An addressed envelope, requiring no postage, is enclosed for your convenience.

GENERAL INFORMATION

School District_____
Name of District

Name of person completing questionnaire_____

Person's title_____ Telephone No._____

Address_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

A. What is the total population of the area served by your school district? (see attached)

____(1) Less than 50,000 ____(2) 50,000-100,000 ____(3) 100,001-200,000
____(4) 200,001-300,000 ____(5) 300,001-400,000 ____(6) 400,001-500,000
____(7) More than 500,000

B. Please list the number of certified staff members in your district.

____(1) M = 119.5

C. What percentage of teachers have as their highest degree:

M = 73.5%(1) B.S., B.A. M = 25.8%(2) M.S., M.A., M.Ed. M = .352%(3) Ph.D., D.Ed.

D. Is the school:

100% (1) Public 0% (2) Private
0% (3) Parochial 0% (4) Other. Please specify._____

_____

E. Is the student population:

0% (1) All male 0%(2) All female 100% (3) Co-educational

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. What is the total population of the area served by your school district?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
0-199	1	14	8.2	8.8	8.8
200-299	2	9	5.3	5.6	14.4
300-399	3	15	8.8	9.4	23.8
400-499	4	14	8.2	8.8	32.5
500-599	5	16	9.4	10.0	42.5
600-699	6	14	8.2	8.8	51.3
700-799	7	6	3.5	3.8	55.0
800-1099	8	29	17.0	18.1	73.1
1100-1499	9	8	4.7	5.0	78.1
1500-1999	10	10	5.8	6.3	84.4
2000-2999	11	7	4.1	4.4	88.8
3000-5599	12	10	5.8	6.3	95.0
5600+	13	8	4.7	5.0	100.0
	.	11	6.4	Missing	
	Total	171	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 11

F. Please list the number of students enrolled in:

M = 34.8 (1) Pre-School
M = [illegible] (2) Elementary (Inc. K.)
M = 393.3 (3) Middle/Junior High
M = 575.3 (4) Senior High

G. The student ethnic ratio . is:

95% (1) % Anglo
.89% (2) % Black
1.0% (3) % Hispanic
.78 % (4) % Asian
.24% (5) % Native American
.1% (6) Other. Please specify._____

H. What percentage of students receive free or reduced-priced lunch?

0% (1) None
M = 27.1% (2) List the percentage who do.

I. Check the procedures included in identifying students for special programs or provisions for gifted students.

0.6% (1) None
64.1% (2) I.Q. tests
92.8% (3) Achievement tests
61.7% (4) Grades
95.2% (5) Teacher nomination
30.5% (6) Peer nomination
28.1% (7) Other. Please specify._____

J. Are there special requirements for teachers in these programs?

38.9% (1) No
61.1% (2) Yes. Please specify._____

K. The following staff members participate in inservice training on a regular basis:

1.2% (1) None
55.0% (2) Teachers in gifted/talented programs
83.4% (3) All teachers
51.5% (4) Counselors
54.4% (5) Administrators
6.5% (6) Other. Please specify._____

L. Is a staff member at the supervisory ot administrative level responsible for the gifted program?

70.4% (1) Yes. Specify title._____
29.6% (2) No

M. Check the following resources your program uses.

98.2% (1) Library
54.0% (2) Museum
50.3% (3) Industry
39.9% (4) Government agency
62.6% (5) Mentors
27.6% (6) Others. Please specify._____

N. Does the district have a written philosophy for educating gifted students?

86.9% (1) Yes
13.1% (2) No

O. Goals for gifted/talented students are written:

74.3% (1) For the district level
34.7% (2) For the building level
8.4% (3) Not at all

P. An advisory group for the gifted/talented program includes:

25.6% (1) Students
46.4% (2) Parents
63.1% (3) Teachers
58.9% (4) Administrators
8.9% (5) Others. Please specify._____
34.5% (6) Does not exist

Q. Special procedures for evaluating the gifted/talented program are established:

58.9% (1) At the district level
40.5% (2) At the building level
16.1% (3) Neither

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

R. What is the per pupil expenditure in your district?

8.7%(1) Less than $1,500 .6% (2) $1,500-$2,000 0% (3) $2,001-$2,500
1.9%(4) $2,501-$3,000 7.5% (5) $3,001-$3,500 47.8% (6) $3,501-$4,000
11.8%(7) $4,001-$4,500 11.2% (8) $4,501-$5,000 10.6% (9) More than $5,000

S. Are special additional budgetary provisions made for gifted/talented students?

87.9%(1) Yes 12.1% (2) No

T. If special funding is available for gifted/talented, check any of the following sources which apply:

68.8%(1) State 71.3% (2) Local 3.8% (3) Federal 1.3%(4) Private
6.4%(5) Other. Please specify._____

U. Please list the program or school in your district which you recommend for a visit from an outside observer.

Name of school 48.8% listed a name.

Address_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

Person to contact_____ Position_____

Telephone No._____ / _____
AC

I. ENRICHMENT IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM. The teacher with or without special assistance, provides enrichment activities for gifted students in a heterogeneous classroom. We include individualized instruction in this category. This type of gifted program is used in 86.0% of the school districts.

V. How many students participate in the enrichment activities?

60.5%(1) All of the class 8.5%(2) Those identified as gifted/talented
31.0%(3) Those identified as gifted/talented plus others, but not including the entire class.

W. How much time is allotted to enrichment activities per week?

68.1%(1) Less than 3 hours 25.9%(2) 3-5 hours 5.9% (3) More than 5 hours

X. Which content areas are enriched?

52.5%(1) Math 46.1%(2) Science 48.9%(3) English/ Language Arts
41.8%(4) Social Studies 62.4%(5) Multidisciplinary
15.6%(6) Other. Please specify._____

Y. The curricular materials used in the enrichment activities are:

31.2%(1) The same as those used in the basic program.
84.8%(2) Different from those used in the basic program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Z. What strategies are used in the enrichment activities?

74.1%(1) Group instruction
60.8% (2) Individual instruction
88.1%(3) Special projects
60.8% (4) Puzzles and games
16.1%(5) Other. Please specify.

II. PART-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. The gifted student is with a heterogeneous class part of the time but is with students of similar ability part of the time. At the elementary level, this provision might be described as a "pull-out" program; on the secondary level it would include honors classes. Resource rooms are considered later as a separate category. This type of gifted program is used in 91.8% of the school districts.

AA. How many days per week does the special class meet?

34.5%(1) 1 day per week
57.6%(2) 2-4 days per week
7.9% (3) 5 days per week

BB. What is the length of each class session?

69.9%(1) Less than 1 hour
26.7% (2) 1-2 hours
3.4% (3) More than 2 hours

CC. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

41.7%(1) Math
35.3%(2) Science
42.9%(3) English/ Language Arts
32.1%(4) Social Studies
73.3%(5) Multidisciplinary
16.0%(6) Other. Please specify.

DD. What strategies are used in the special class?

85.0%(1) Group instruction
83.0%(2) Individual instruction
96.1%(3) Special projects
71.2%(4) Puzzles and games
12.4%(5) Other. Please specify.

EE. Do the regular classroom teacher and the special class teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans:

14.3%(1) Regularly
72.1%(2) Occasionally
13.6%(3) Not at all

FF. Is a student required to make up work covered in the regular classroom during his/her absence?

66.7%(1) Yes
33.3%(2) No

III. FULL-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. At the elementary level, this might be a self contained or departmentalized classroom of high-ability students. At the secondary level, this might be a single course in which the student's curriculum in enriched and accelerated. See XV for situations where two or more classes are integrated and fast-paced. This type of gifted program is used in 34.5% of the school districts

GG. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

62.5% (1) Math
33.9% (2) Science
46.4% (3) English/ Language Arts
26.8% (4) Social Studies
44.6% (5) Multidisciplinary
10.7% (6) Other. Please specify.

HH. Are the curricular materials the same as those studied in regular classes?

13.5% (1) Yes
84.6% (2) No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. How are students assigned to special classes?

84.6% (1) Specific selection criteria 25.0% (2) Self-selection

JJ. Is the amount of curricular material covered:

22.0% (1) About the same as in the regular classes 78.0% (2) Greater than in the regular classes

---

IV. INDEPENDENT STUDY. A student chooses certain areas for investigation and assumes a high degree of responsibility for meeting objectives. This type of gifted program is used in 63.7% of the school districts.

KK. How much time is allotted to independent studies per week?

56.7% (1) Less than 3 hours 36.5% (2) 3-5 hours 6.7% (3) More than 5 hours

LL. In which content areas do students engage in independent study?

33.6% (1) Math 36.4% (2) Science 37.4% (3) English/ Language Arts

33.6% (4) Social Studies 65.4% (5) Multidisciplinary

24.3% (6) Other. Please specify. _____

MM. What resources do the students use in independent study?

91.6% (1) Staff 94.4% (2) Library 78.5% (3) Community 52.3% (4) Laboratory

30.8% (5) Other. Please specify. _____

NN. How is a student's independent study progress evaluated?

61.3% (1) Self 97.2% (2) Teacher

19.8% (3) Other. Please specify. _____

V. ITINERANT TEACHER. A teacher with special skills in gifted education teaches gifted students in more than one school on a regular basis. This type of gifted program is used in 49.7% of the school districts.

OO. How many schools do itinerant teachers serve?

92.9% (1) Less than 5 7.1% (2) 5-10 .0% (3) More than 10

PP. Do itinerant teachers teach in:

6.0% (1) The regular classroom teacher's room

31.3% (2) A permanent classroom assigned for the purpose

62.7% (3) In a variety of settings

QQ. Do the regular classroom teacher and the itinerant teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans?

17.1% (1) Regularly 73.2% (2) Occasionally 9.8% (3) Not at all

RR. What is the average number of miles driven by an itinerant teacher per week, exclusive of the distance to and from the home?

88.9% (1) Less than 50 miles 8.6% (2) 50-100 miles 2.5% (3) More than 100 miles

---

VI. MENTORSHIPS. We define mentorships as a program which assigns gifted students to work or study with adults who have special knowledge or skills in the students' areas of interest. We include the High School Executive Internship Program in this category. This type of gifted program is used in 36.3% of the school districts.

SS. How much school time is allotted to a student to work with a mentor?

37.9% (1) None; it is an out of school program
43.1% (2) Less than 3 hours per week
19.0% (3) 3-5 hours per week
0% (4) More than five hours per week

TT. Is Carnegie credit awarded for work with mentors?

21.8% (1) Yes
72.7% (2) No
5.5% (3) Sometimes

UU. How are mentors selected?

60.8% (1) On a voluntary basis
53.3% (2) Specific criteria
47.1% (3) Recommendations

VV. Who are the mentors?

60.8% (1) School staff
31.4% (2) University faculty
86.3% (3) Business and professional people
15.7% (4) Other. Please specify._____

WW. Do mentors receive special training?

20.8% (1) Yes
79.2% (2) No

XX. Are mentors paid?

2.0% (1) Yes
98.0% (2) No

VII. RESOURCE ROOMS. This might be a corner of the library or an entire room where gifted students go individually or in groups to explore special areas of study. This type of gifted program is used in 44.4% of the school districts.

YY. How much time per week does a student spend in a resource room?

83.6% (2) Less than 3 hours
14.9% (3) 3-5 hours
1.5% (4) More than 5 hours

ZZ. Time scheduled in the resource room is:

63.2% (1) The same each week
36.8% (2) Varied from week to week

AAA. Who is in charge of the resource room?

90.3% (1) Special teacher of the gifted
16.7% (2) Librarian
5.6% (3) Aide
0% (4) Parent
0% (5) Community Volunteers

BBB. What materials are available in the resource room?

95.7% (1) Books
50.7% (2) Films
71.0% (3) Packets
62.3% (4) Other. Please specify._____

CCC. What equipment is available in the resource room?

41.2% (1) Laboratory equipment
5.9% (2) Shop tools
72.5% (3) Other. Please specify._____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DDD. Where is the resource room located?

72.1% (1) In a separate room
14.8% (2) In the library
13.1% (3) Other. Please specify._____

VIII. SPECIAL SCHOOLS. These include magnet schools which focus on a single discipline as well as those which include the entire spectrum. Also included are residential schools for the gifted.
This type of gifted program is used in 2.3% of the school districts.

EEE. The special school is:

0% (1) Residential
100% (2) Non-residential

FFF. The special school has a:

0% (1) General curriculum
100% (2) Special area of concentration. Please specify_____

GGG. Is the school considered a magnet school?

50.0% (1) Yes
50% (2) No

HHH. How are the students selected?

25% (1) Self-selected
75% (2) Specific criteria

III. Is the school considered a school for gifted students?

75% (1) Yes
25% (2) No

JJJ. Do the students pay tuition?

0% (1) Yes
100% (2) No

KKK. How long has the school been in existence?

75% (1) Less than 5 years
0% (2) 5-10 years
25% (3) More than 10 years

IX. EARLY ENTRANCE. We define early entrance as a policy allowing students to enter a school earlier than the normal age for that district. This type of gifted program is used in 20.5% of the school districts.

LLL. At what level(s) is the provision for early entrance made?

27.6% (1) Kindergarten
44.8% (2) First grade
48.3% (3) Middle/Junior High School
72.4% (4) Senior High School

MMM. How many students entered these levels last year due to early entrance policy? List the numbers please.

M = .37 (1) Kindergarten
M = .41 (2) First grade
M = 1.1 (3) Middle/Junior High School
M = 4.0 (4) Senior High School

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NNN. On what basis were early assignments made? Check all that apply.

80.0% (1) Ability test
73.3% (2) Achievement test
80.0% (3) Teacher recommendation
70.0% (4) Parental request
20.0% (5) Other. Please specify._____

OOO. Of the number accepted last year as early entrants, how many continued for at least one full year? List numbers at the appropriate levels please. c.f., LLL

M = .26 (1) Kindergarten
M = .58 (2) First grade
M = 1.5 (3) Middle/Junior High School
M = 3.5 (4) Senior High School

PPP. Last year how many students left high school prior to graduation to enter college or university?

0% (1) None
M = 4.7 (2) List the number, please

QQQ. How long has the early-entrance policy existed in your district?

35.7% (1) Less than 5 years
42.9% (2) 5-10 years
21.4% (3) More than 10 years

X. CONTINUOUS PROGRESS. We define continuous progress as a provision for students to progress through the curriculum of one or more subject areas as the required skills are mastered. This type of gifted program is used in 27.5% of the school districts.

RRR. At which level(s) is continuous progress in operation?

2.2% (1) Pre-School
68.9% (2) Elementary (Inc. K)
57.8% (3) Middle/Junior High School
55.6% (4) Senior High School

SSS. In what content areas does continuous progress allow students to advance at their own pace?

91.3% (1) Math
32.6% (2) Science
8.7% (3) Social Studies
43.5% (4) Language Arts (inc. Reading)
21.7% (5) English
8.7% (6) Foreign Language
8.7% (7) Other. Please specify._____

TTT. On what basis does a student move from one level to another?

45.7% (1) Standardized tests
45.7% (2) Teacher made tests
91.3% (3) Demonstrated competency
4.3% (4) Other. Please specify._____

UUU. What percentage of students are functioning above grade level in one or more content areas this year?

40.5% (1) Less than 5%
26.2% (2) 5-10%
14.3% (3) 11-20%
19.0% (4) More than 20%

VVV. How would you describe the continuous progress program?

54.5% (1) Group instruction
65.9% (2) Individual instruction
9.1% (3) Other. Please specify._____

WWW. How long has the continuous progress program been in operation?

57.8% (1) Less than 5 years
28.9% (2) 5-10 years
13.3% (3) More than 10 years

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

XI. NONGRADED SCHOOL. We define a nongraded school as one in which the usual labels, such as first grade, have been removed, and students progress at their own pace. Thus, one child might complete what is normally covered in one grade in less than the usual amount of time, and another child might require more than the usual amount of time to gain the skills generally acquired in one year in a graded school system. This type of gifted program is used in only 7.0% of the school districts.

XXX. At what level(s) is your district nongraded?

20.0%(1) Pre-School
80.0% (2) Elementary (Inc. K)
30.0%(3) Middle/Junior High School
30.0% (4) Senior High School

YYY. Do some students complete the level(s) checked in fewer years than is normally required?

45.5%(1) Yes
54.5% (2) No

ZZZ. If you answered "Yes" how many students:

M = 71.5 (1) Received additional enrichment only
M = 311.3 (2) Were offered curricula from the next higher level but did not leave the first school
M = 74 (3) Moved on to the next higher school

AAAA. How long has your district been nongraded?

40% (1) Less than 5 years
50% (2) 5-10 years
10% (3) More than 10 years

XII. MODERATE ACCELERATION. We define moderate acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete the grades K-12 in less than thirteen years but more than ten. This type of gifted program is used in only 46.2% of the school districts.

BBBB. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

64.6%(1) Less than 100
25.3% (2) 100-500
10.1%(3) More than 500

CCCC. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 13 years but more than 10 in grade K-12?

74.3%(1) Less than 2%
13.3% (2) 2-5%
12.2%(3) More than 5%

DDDD. How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged moderate acceleration?

8.3%(1) Less than 2 years
20.8% (2) 2-5 years
70.8% (3) More than 5 years

XIII. RADICAL ACCELERATION. We define radical acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete grades K-12 in fewer than 11 years. This type of gifted program is used on only 17.5% of the school districts.

EEEE. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

45.2% (1) Less than 100
35.5% (2) 100-500
19.4%(3) More than 500

FFFF. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 11 years in grade K-12?

91.3% (1) Less than 1%
8.7% (2) 1-2%
0% (3) More than 2%

GGGG . How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged radical acceleration?

21.1% (1) Less than 2 years
21.1% (2) 2-5 years
57.9%(3) More than 5 years

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

XIV. COLLEGE BOARD ADVANCED PLACEMENT. As the name specifies, we refer to the Advanced Placement of the College Board. This type of gifted program is used in 40.9% of the school districts.

HHHH. How long has your school offered College Board Advanced Placement Courses?

44.9% (1) Less than 5 years 40.6% (2) 5-10 years 14.5% (3) More than 10 years

IIII. In what content areas does your school offer Advanced Placement courses?

35.9% (1) American History 4.7% (2) Art-History 35.9% (3) Biology 29.7% (4) Chemistry
62.5% (5) English Composition/Literature 28.1% (6) English Language/Composition
14.1% (7) European History 6.3% (8) French 1.6% (9) German 1.6% (10) Latin
70.3% (11) Mathematics 1.6% (12) Music 15.6% (13) Physics 9.4% (14) Spanish

JJJJ. How many students completed at least one Advanced Placement course last year? List the number please.

M = 2.5 (1) Sophomores M = 10 (2) Juniors M = 28.4 (3) Seniors
M = .6 (4) Other. Please specify._____

KKKK. How many students took at least one Advanced Placement examination last year? List the number please.

M = 2.5 (1) Sophomores M = 7.9 (2) Juniors M = 20.4 (3) Seniors
M = .3 (4) Other. Please specify._____

LLLL. What percentage of the examinations received a score of:

27.4% (1) "3" 27.9% (2) "4" 9.3% (3) "5"

MMMM. How were the Advanced Placement opportunities offered?

82.5% (1) Conventional classes
35.1% (2) Independent study
7.0% (3) Seminars
10.5% (4) Correspondence courses
3.5% (5) Other. Please specify._____

XV. FAST PACED COURSES. We define fast paced courses as an arrangement which allows a student to complete two or more courses in a discipline in an abbreviated time span. This type of gifted program is used in 12.9% of the school districts.

NNNN. Last year, how many students were enrolled is such courses in:

M = 3.5 (1) Mathematics M = 1.2 (2) Foreign language M = 1.4 (3) Science
M = 28 (4) Other. Please specify._____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

XVI. CONCURRENT OR DUAL ENROLLMENT. We define concurrent or dual enrollment as an arrangment which allows a student to enroll in classes on two campuses. For example, a middle/junior high student who takes one or moreclasses at the high school or a high school student who takes one or more classes on a college campus. This type of gifted program is used in 55.0% of the school districts.

OOOO. How many students enrolled in classes on two campuses last year? Please specify the numbers.

M = 10.2(1) Middle/Junior High and Senior High combination
M = .95 (2) Middle/Junior High and College combination
M = 22.7(3) Senior High and College combination

PPPP. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and senior high, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?

8.5%(1) Less than 50% 4.3% (2) 50-75% 27.7%(3) 76-99% 59.6%(4) 100%

QQQQ. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?

5.6%(1) Less than 50% 0% (2) 50-75% 33.3% (3) 76-99% 61.1% (4) 100%

RRRR. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both a senior high school and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?

1.1%(1) Less than 50% 3.3% (2) 50-75% 42.9% (3) 76-99% 52.7% (4) 100%

OTHER. If your school has a provision or program for gifted students not listed in any of the above sections, please describe it briefly.

4.7% of the school districts filled out this section.

Thank You!

Dr. Frank P. Belcastro
Dept. of Ed./Psychology
University of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa 52001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE